



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,925	06/14/2001	Kei Yamada	01358/LH	8053
1933	7590	02/01/2006	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC			DIVINE, LUCAS	
220 Fifth Avenue			ART UNIT	
16TH Floor			PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			2624	

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,925

Applicant(s)

YAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

Lucas Divine

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 75-139 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 75-139 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1 – 74 are canceled. Claims 75 – 139 are new and pending.
2. Abstract and drawings and previous 112 rejections withdrawn due to amendments.
3. New IDS reviewed.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to previous, now canceled, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argued chiefly upon the newly submitted independent claims, to which the previous art is not re-applied. Some art used to show obvious features of dependent claims is reused, but no response is made in view of no specific arguments to specific features of dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 92 – 100 and 115 – 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Fig. 7 of application specifically shows the relay servers (parent and child as

Art Unit: 2624

well as in general) being separate physical devices NOT comprised in another relay server.

Thus, the limitations such as “relay server comprises a plurality relay servers” introduce new matter into the claims and are rejected for this reason.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 92 – 100 and 115 – 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims include language such as “relay server comprises a plurality relay servers”. Applicant defines a relay server as a specific item and it is unclear how one item has many of itself comprised within itself.

Examiner suggests reverting to previous language of “wherein there is a plurality of relaying servers” instead of “relay server comprises a plurality of relay servers” to make the claims definite. (*Examiner note: for claims 92 and 115, this was the interpretation used*) Specifically look to claims 92, 93, 97, 98, 115, 116, 120, and 121 for indefiniteness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2624

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 75, 76, 80 – 82, 85, 87 – 91, 101, 103, 104 105, 108, 110 – 114, 124, 126, 127, 131 – 134, 137 and 139 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng et al. (US 6240456) in view of Motoyama et al. (US 6714971) and Mui et al. (US 6362870).

Regarding claim 75, Teng et al. teaches **an image forming apparatus administration system** (Figs. 2 and 5), **comprising:**

an image forming apparatus (printer 50, Figs. 2 and 5),

an administration apparatus (network client 20, Figs. 2 and 5 – used for monitoring and administering printing apparatuses [col. 7 lines 55-60]), **and**

at least one relay server (network server 49, Figs. 2 and 5),

wherein

the image forming apparatus comprises a transmitting section which transmits first information representing a state of the image forming apparatus to the relaying server (col. 8 lines 15-21, wherein the printer transmits status and/or error information [examples shown in Figs. 8-14] to the spooler 74 when the information that is requested wasn't already transmitted and stored previously [thus incurring the polling of the device to get information]);

the relaying server comprises a relaying storage for storing the first information (spooler 74, Figs. 2 and 5 – stores information in both directions, first [col. 8 lines 15-18, wherein the spooler stores the information requested by the user and sends it to the user when requested, also receives the information from the printer] and second

[print queue, col. 7 lines 21, 43-44, 67 as well as storing while processing col. 7 lines 5-6]);

the administration apparatus comprises an accessing section which accesses the relaying server to obtain the first information stored in the relaying server (col. 7 line 61 – col. 8 line 9, wherein the client accesses the server to retrieve info on the system, e.g. printer status and other examples given in text – col. 8 lines 15-17 teach the server gathering the information from spooler 74, which has stored the information – col. 8 lines 30-33 teach the requested first information being sent to the user);

the administration apparatus comprises a transmitting section which transmits second information to the relaying server (HTTP command messages sent from client to server, col. 2 lines 59-61, col. 6 lines 63-67, Figs. 8 – 14 are examples of controlling second information), said second information being stored in the relaying storage (print queue, col. 7 lines 21, 43-44, 67 as well as storing while processing col. 7 lines 5-6); and

the image forming apparatus comprises an accessing section which accesses 'connects to' the relaying server to obtain 'receive' the second information from the relaying storage (col. 7 lines 5-9, wherein the control data is passed from spooler 74 to printer 50, Figs. 2 and 5 show the system spooler 74 issuing the requests and receiving information from the printer 50), and the image forming apparatus is controlled in accordance with the second information (col. 2 line 67 & col. 5 lines 59-60 & col. 8 lines 40-59, wherein the logical endpoint [e.g. printer] performs whatever control operation job [print jobs, save jobs, administrative tasks] was submitted by user).

Teng specifically teaches that the distributed computer network system may be located in any common networking environment and other means of networking may be used (col. 5 lines 1 – 22) and that the system of the invention is located on the Internet (discussed throughout).

Teng also teaches that the files are communicated to the printer from the server, thus a 'push' printing model, and that the printer and server have bi-directional communications (Fig. 5, col.8 line 20), not the 'pull' (access server to obtain) model of the claim.

So, Teng does not specifically teach multiple local networks accessing the Internet through firewalls in a printing system and that the printer accesses the control data from the server in a 'pull' model.

However Motoyama teaches a printing system that has multiple local networks accessing the Internet through firewalls in a printing system (Figs. 1, 5, 11, and 12 – specifically note Fig. 11: resource admin 530 connected to internet 10 through firewall 536, server 502 with storage 501 connected to internet 10 through firewall 506, and image forming apparatus 524 connected to internet 10 through firewall 526).

As Teng states as cited above, it would have been obvious to use any common Internet printing configuration in the system of Teng, thus including the Internet configuration of Motoyama. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the configuration of Teng to span across the globe, to provide safe communications through firewalls, and other very common reasons for allowing multiple local networks in a Internet printing system.

The combination though, still does not teach the 'pull' printing model that allows the printer to access the server for control information.

Art Unit: 2624

However, Mui clearly teaches such a 'pull' configuration in a printing system (col. 9 lines 14-20, wherein that commands for the printer can be retrieved/accessed from the source instead of the 'push' model) and that the 'pull' configuration for printing systems was known at the time of Mui's filing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the printer to access the server to pull the information to it as taught by Mui. The motivations for doing so would have been to allow the printer to retrieve data when it is ready to receive more data instead of having the data pushed when it might not be finished printing or have a full memory, to allow the server not to have to poll the devices to check status to decide when to transmit, and to reduce complexity and load on the server because it would only have to receive and store the jobs instead of routing to the correct printer, the printer could connect and see if there were any jobs for its URL and download if so, this is especially beneficial in networks such as the combined system of Teng and Motoyama, where there are many printers.

Regarding claim 103, the structural elements of apparatus claim 75 include all of the structural elements of apparatus claim 103. Therefore, claim 103 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 75.

Examiner Note: The final two limitations of apparatus claim 75 are not in 103, but are included in dependent claim 116. Since they have already been rejected here, no added discussion will be in the rejection of claim 116 for these specific limitations.

Regarding claim 126, the structural elements of apparatus claim 75 include all of the structural elements of apparatus claim 126. Therefore, claim 126 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 75.

Regarding claims 76 and 127, which depend from claims 75 and 126, Teng teaches **the second information (e.g. print job or other control command) comprises ID information for identifying the image forming apparatus (URL col. 5 line 55), and job information for causing the image forming apparatus to perform a predetermined action (col. 5 lines 45-62 and col. 8 lines 55-58 showing different actions that could be performed by commands from the client); and**

the image forming apparatus, which is identified with the ID information, executes the predetermined action in accordance with the job information (col. 5 lines 58-61).

Regarding claims 80 and 131, which depend from claims 76 and 127, the combination further teaches **the image forming apparatus comprises a determining section which determines whether any said second information including the ID information identifying the image forming apparatus is present on the relaying server; and the accessing section of the image forming apparatus obtains the second information from the relaying storage when the determining section determines that the second information including the ID information identifying the image forming apparatus is present on the relaying server (in the combined system with the 'pull' model, the printer inherently accesses the server to see if**

any data is related to it, and since URLs are used to identify the printer, it must determine if any URLs are for it, and subsequently download in the combined 'pull' model system).

Regarding claim 132, which depends from claim 126, Teng teaches **the communication section transmits status information representing a state of the image forming apparatus to the relay server** (Figs. 8 – 14, col. 7 line 61 – col. 8 line 9, wherein anything from status to printer properties can be sent to the server and eventually to the user).

Regarding claims 81, 104, and 133, which depend from claims 75, 103, and 132, the combination further teaches **the transmitting section of each of the image forming apparatus and the administration apparatus repeats the transmission of the corresponding one of the first information and the second information when the relaying server does not receive the one of the first information and the second information normally** (the combined Internet administration system uses TCP/IP packets to send data over the Internet, at the end of each packet of TCP/IP is a checksum field that is checked both at sending and receiving and if the packet has an error in transmission, the packet is resent, thus, the sending device [either the host apparatus 21 or the printer 71] resends the packet if it is confirmed [by computing the checksum] that the packet has not been received correctly).

Regarding claims 82, 105, and 134, which depend from claims 75, 103, and 132, Teng teaches **first information comprises inherent data of the image forming apparatus** (Figs. 8 –

Art Unit: 2624

14, col. 7 line 61 – col. 8 line 9, wherein anything from status to printer properties can be sent to the server and eventually to the user).

Regarding claims 85, 108, and 137, which depend from claims 82, 105, and 134, Teng teaches **the inherent data comprises emergency information based on an error in the image forming apparatus** (col. 9 lines 14-18, col. 8 line 19 and other locations throughout, further error types discussed in lines 26-28).

Regarding claims 87, 110, and 139, which depend from claims 82, 105, and 134, Teng teaches **the image forming apparatus comprises an administrated storage** (inherent to printers is some form of memory [e.g. RAM cache registers disk ROM] to complete printing tasks) **which stores the inherent data transmitted to the relay server in accordance with the second information** (one example of inherent data is printer properties from the printer col. 8 line 1, which inherently are stored – another example is status, which is retrieved from printer storage by the polling operation of the spooler in col. 8 lines 18-21).

Regarding claims 88 and 111, which depend from claims 82 and 105, Teng teaches **the image forming apparatus does not obtain the second information from the relaying server while the first information is transmitted to the relaying server** (e.g. a print job is sent, it is processed, and then the result is returned, thus, while the first information is transmitted to the relaying server, the second information [print job] is not occurring since it has already completed).

Regarding claims 89 and 112, which depend from claims 82 and 105, the combination teaches **the transmitting section of the image repeats the transmission of the first information to the relaying server when the relaying server does not receive the first information normally** (the combined Internet administration system uses TCP/IP packets to send data over the Internet, at the end of each packet of TCP/IP is a checksum field that is checked both at sending and receiving and if the packet has an error in transmission, the packet is resent, thus, the sending device [either the host apparatus 21 or the printer 71] resends the packet if it is confirmed [by computing the checksum] that the packet has not been received correctly)..

Regarding claims 90, 91, 113, and 114, which depend from claims 75 and 103, the combination teaches **the accessing section of the image forming apparatus accesses the relaying server in accordance with a predetermined timing** (Fig. 12 of Teng shows the ability to schedule the printer so that it accepts print jobs/is in service during certain parts of the day – in the combined ‘pull’ model system, when the printer starts being available [e.g. 8:00am, predetermined timing] it would then start the checking for any commands at the server at that time) and **wherein the predetermined timing is at least one of: times at a predetermined interval, a predetermined time of day** (e.g. 8:00am as set shown in Fig. 12 to start the availability of the printer).

Regarding claims 101 and 124, which depend from claims 75 and 103, Teng teaches **the relay server creates information in accordance with the first information** (step 120, Fig. 7

and its description), **and the administration apparatus obtains the information created by the relaying server** (step 122 in response to the request 112, Fig. 7 and its description).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 77, 79, 128, and 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Motoyama, and Mui as applied to claims 76 and 127 above, and further in view of Kim et al. (US 6473788).

Regarding claims 77 and 128, which depend from claims 76 and 127, while the combination of Teng, Motoyama, and Mui teach issuing controlling commands and administrating tasks to a printer, the combination does not specifically speak to the administration tasks as including printer updates.

However, Kim teaches a very similar http/URL/Internet administration system (see similar screens of Fig. 7 of Kim and Fig. 8 of Teng for examples as well as Fig. 1 of Kim and Fig. 11 of Motoyama – Fig. 10 of Kim is specifically for administration of printers) including sending **job information comprises at least an updating program or updating data for controlling said image forming apparatus** (Kim teaches an administration upgrade firmware option shown in 150 in Fig. 10; col. 8 line 58, firmware is updating data for controlling the printers);

the image forming apparatus comprises an administrated storage for storing at least a program or data (firmware by its nature is stored in the ROM of the printer); **and**

the image forming apparatus rewrites the program or data, stored in said administrated storage with said updating program or updating data (updating firmware

Art Unit: 2624

includes the sending of firmware to the image forming apparatus and the running of the installing of the firmware).

Since upgrading firmware is a common administration task for printers, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the administrator of Teng, Motoyama, and Mui to perform such task. Other motivations for updating printers are to keep up with new features implemented in the technology and to solve possible problems with old firmware.

Regarding claims 79 and 130, which depend from claims 77 and 128, Kim further teaches that **mage forming apparatus does not access the relaying server while said updating program or updating data is rewritten in the image forming apparatus** (it is implied by the term firmware that the complete update of ROM is completed, thus no function [printing, network access, anything else] is done while firmware is updated).

9. Claims 78 and 129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Motoyama, Mui, and Kim as applied to claims 77 and 128 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Regarding claims 78 and 129, which depend from claims 77 and 128, while the combined system teaches upgrading firmware in a system that sends data and commands from a client through a server to a printer, the combination does not specifically teach that the **image forming apparatus obtains the updating program or updating data by downloading from the relaying server**.

Art Unit: 2624

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that well known prior art teaches **image forming apparatus obtains the updating program or updating data by downloading from the relaying server** (update servers are well known in the art to have the data for the printer to download to run).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the programs on the server for the printer to download. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the clients to not have to have large storage and have all of the updates at one central place to select from. Further, the printer would only have to download from one place than from different clients if multiple downloads would take place.

10. Claims 83, 84, 106, 107, 135, and 136 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Motoyama, and Mui as applied to claims 82, 105, and 134 above, and further in view of Ogura (US 5893005).

Regarding claims 83, 106, and 135, which depend from claims 82, 105, and 134, while the combination teaches a system that reports printer properties, status, etcetera, the combination does not specifically teach the status information to include **usage history information of said image forming apparatus**.

Ogura teaches a system similar to the system of Teng shown in Fig. 5 that receives and sends status data through a communication control unit that acts as a relay server in between the printers and the administering device (status sending shown in Figs. 9 and 10). Ogura also teaches setting up a predetermined time for reporting to the administering device (Fig. 13). Further, Ogura teaches sending **usage history information of the image forming apparatus**

Art Unit: 2624

(Fig. 13B, wherein the number of copied sheets gives the history of how much the device has been used).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the combination of Teng, Motoyama, and Mui could include information as to how many sheets of paper had been used. The motivation for doing so would have been to know the how long before new sheets would need to be added. The same motivation applies for other reports back to the user where the user knows something in order to better plan for the future in ordering supplies and maintenance on a device.

Regarding claims 84, 107, and 136, which depend from claims 82, 105, and 134, Ogura teaches the counting of the number of copied sheets in the system (Fig. 13B) which reads on **counting at least one of ... (4) a number of recording mediums with images formed thereon.**

11. Claims 86, 109, and 138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Motoyama, and Mui as applied to claims 85, 108, and 137 above, and further in view of Tanaka (US 6791702).

Regarding claims 86, 109, and 138, which depend from claims 85, 108, and 137, while the combination teaches the reporting of errors to the user, the combination does not specifically teach the feature of detecting the seriousness of the error and making a reporting decision based on the detection.

However, Tanaka teaches an Internet/HTTP printing system (Fig. 2&3) including

the image forming apparatus (110) comprises a detecting section which detects the error (Notice data generator 105 with the notice address manager 108 performs steps S407, S504), **and which determines a seriousness of the error as one of temporary or serious** (col. 9 lines 50-59 and col. 10 lines 25-28 discuss the determination); **and**

the image forming apparatus transmits the emergency information to the relaying server when the error is determined to be serious (col. 9 lines 50-59 and col. 10 lines 25-28, if a serious error occurs, the notice is sent to the printer supporter, which refers to person administrating [note Teng, printer support by administrator col. 7 line 67] the printer, e.g. for fixing the printer – thus the administration device of Teng).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to let the user know (printer manager) know about minor error such absence of paper, etc. and the administrator (printer supporter) know about serious errors such as hardware errors, etc. The motivation for doing so would have been to let the correct person know who can and should fix the error in a timely and correct fashion. For example, users generally know how to replace paper, but serious errors they do not have the training to fix the issue and sometimes can do more harm than good if they try. Thus, notifying the correct person to handle errors is advantageous and would be an obvious benefit to one of ordinary skill in the art in the system of Teng, Motoyama, and Mui.

12. Claims 92 and 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Motoyama, and Mui as applied to claims 75 and 103 above, and further in view of Motamed et al. (US 6519053).

Regarding claims 92 and 115, which depend from claims 75 and 103, while Teng, Motoyama, and Mui teach an Internet printing system and Teng specifically teaches that the system can be developed in any type of networking environment with clients, servers, and printers (col. 5 lines 1-22), the combination does not specifically teach a plurality of servers and accessing another server when the current server is not available.

However, Motamed teaches a system of administering to print devices **the at least one relaying server comprises a plurality of relaying servers** (Fig. 1C which teaches it is known in the art to have printer server systems [e.g. 3500] where multiple relay servers [e.g. 3520, 3540 etc. – note with memories like in Teng and Motoyama] work between the client ‘administration’ computer [e.g. 3100, 3000] and the printers [e.g. 4020, 4040, etc.]);

the transmitting section of the image forming apparatus transmits the first information to a predetermined first relaying server of the plurality of relaying server, and the accessing section of the image forming apparatus access the first relaying server (Fig. 1C, see Printer 4020 accessing first direct server 3520 as a predetermined server to access for bi-directional communication like the claim and like Teng); **and**

the transmitting section of the image forming apparatus transmits the first information to an alternative relaying server of the plurality of relaying servers, when it is not possible to transmit the first information to the first relaying server, and the accessing section of the image forming apparatus access the alternative relaying server, when it is not possible to access the first relaying server (while printer 4020 has a first server, it is still connected to the printer server system 3500 so that when 3520 is not available, the printer can access server 3540, 60 or 80, which is the point of a server system like 3500).

Art Unit: 2624

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that networked systems include multiple servers for redundancy, uptime, and performance benefits. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the server system of the printing system of Motamed in the Internet printing system of Teng, Motoyama, and Mui.

13. Claims 102 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Mui, and Motoyama as applied to claims 101 and 124 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (US 6031623).

Regarding claims 102 and 125, which depend from claims 101 and 124, while Teng teaches notifying a user of the status of a print job (including the properties and completed – see Fig. 8, where wihaic will be notified the completion status 200 of the print job), the combination does not specifically teach the administration apparatus accessing the relay server at a predetermined timing.

However, Smith teaches a browser like that of the client of Teng, accessing the server to update information at predetermined timings (col. 13 lines 40-45, wherein a browser can poll for requested information at predetermined times).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that in a printing system such as the combination of Teng, Motoyama, and Mui, the user would want to know when the jobs are completed without having to check over and over. The motivations for adding the automatically updating of the browser would have been to allow the user to continually be updated on the status of the printing system and to allow the user to generate reports of the print jobs at certain times of the day.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 93 – 100 and 116 – 123 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gross et al., US 6918082, 7-12-2005: teaches electronic document proofing system including a printer retrieving files from the server, see col. 9 lines 9-15.

Mazzagatte et al., US 6862583, 3-1-2005 : teaches authenticated secure printing including printer retrieving the print job from the server storage, see col. 10 lines 25-30.

Yanagidara, US 6490052, 12-3-2002: teaches printer controller, including a printer information database 56 which stores at the server printer information that the users downloads through a http browser. *Examiner feels Yanagidara teaches specific features that are applicable to claim 103 and suggests a review for these reasons.*

Sasaki et al., US 6633400, 10-14-2003 : teaches print system.

Art Unit: 2624

O'Brien et al., US 2003/0208569, 11-6-2003 : teaches system and method for upgrading networked devices including upgrades and a device polling the server, specifically look to elements similar to claims 77-79 and 95, 99, 100 (and similar claims).

Kannan, US 2001/0054064, 12-20-2001: teaches method system and computer program product for providing customer service over the world-wide web including polling unit that allows the browser to poll periodically or non-periodically which is similar to features in claims 102 and 125.

The Hard Copy Observer, Volume VII Number 3, March 1997, pages 45-46: teaches a pull model print system accessing sites on servers at predetermined times as well as automatic printer upgrades.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lucas Divine whose telephone number is 571-272-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Lucas Divine
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

ljd